REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are independent claims. Claims 1-30 stand rejected. Applicants amend claim 1, 11, and 21, and cancel claims 6, 16, and 26.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 18, 20 – 28, 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent Application No. 09/776,598 ("Peng"). Without conceding the proprietary of the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the substance of claim 6. With respect to amended claim 1, the Examiner stated in an Office Action that FIG. 7 – 16 and paragraphs [0094] – [0096] teach the elements of claim 6. Applicants disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that Peng fails to teach or suggest "storing, by the first instance of the data platform, a change to a first change unit of a first item, wherein the first item is a child of a parent item and the first item and the parent item are included in the plurality of items; storing, by the first instance of the data platform after the change to the first change unit of the first item, a change to a parent change unit of the parent item." Applicants have reviewed Peng in its entirety and submit that Peng is silent with regard to parent child relationships.

Applicants submit that Peng fails to teach or suggest "maintaining, by the first instance of the data platform, a separate vector, wherein the separate vector corresponds to the enumerated changes to the first instance of the data platform, and a most recent known change number of a second instance of the data platform, wherein the separate vector represents all changes that have been made to the first instance of the data platform" as required by amended claim 1. According to Peng, a "version vector is a vector of a pair of indicators: replica – ID and time stamp. The replica-ID identifies an object store replica in a system. The time stamp is typically generated by an object store replica to indicate the last known time (not necessarily the actual last time) that the object store replica has updated at least one of its objects." (Peng at paragraph [0036]). Applicants submit the version vector in claim 1 is patentably distinct from the version vector taught by Peng.

Applicants additionally submit that Peng fails to teach or suggest "determining, by the first instance of the data platform, that the second instance of the data platform does not include the change to the first change unit of the first item and the change to the parent change unit of the parent item in accordance with the second vector; and transmitting, by the first instance of the data platform, the change to the parent change unit of the parent item prior to transmitting the change to the first change unit of the first item." Applicants submit that changes in Peng are packed together and sent in a request sync message without regard to the order in which they were modified. (See, e.g., Peng at paragraph [0080] and [0081]). Accordingly, for at least these reasons Applicants submit that claim 1 patentably defines over Peng. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 1.

Insomuch as independent claims 11 and 21 recite similar elements to that of claim 1, they too patentably define over Peng for at least similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections to claims 11, and 21.

Insomuch as claims 2 – 5, 7 – 10, 12 – 15, 17 – 20, 22 – 25, and 27 – 30 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, or 21 they too patentably define over Peng for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1, 11, and 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections to claims 2 – 5, 7 – 10, 12 – 15, 17 – 20, 22 – 25, and 27 – 30.

With respect to dependent claim 8, the Examiner stated that paragraphs [0091] – [0093] and Figs 7 – 16 teach "[t]he method of claim 7 wherein, for a first instance having a parent Item and a first child Item to said parent Item, when said child Item is deleted and then said parent Item is deleted, said first instance sending only the change to said parent Item to a second instance during a synchronization where (a) the deletion of a parent Item automatically results in the deletion of all children Items for said parent or (b) the second instance, receiving the tombstone for the parent Item, proceeds to delete the parent Item and automatically deletes the child Item." Applicants disagree. As stated above with respect to claim 1, Peng is silent with respect to parent child relationships. Accordingly, for this additional reason Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 8.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 9, 19, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Peng in view of U.S. Applicant No. 10/608,537 ("Sakaki"). With respect to claim 9, the Examiner stated that paragraphs [0045], [0068] and Figs. 3A – 6 teach "a first Relationship and a second Relationship of a first instance swap names using a temporary name element such that, in order, (a) the name of the first Relationship is transferred to said temporary name element, (b) the name of the second Relationship is transferred to said first Relationship, and (c) said name stored in the temporary name element is copied to said second Relationship, and wherein said first instance synchronizes with a second instance and sends a duo of change units representing, in order, (i) the new name for said first Relationship and (ii) the new name for said second Relationship, and wherein effecting the first change of said duo of changes results in an attempted change having an error in the second instance because a result of said first change is for the first Relationship and the second Relationship having the same name, a method by which said second instance proceed to copy said name of the first Relationship to a local temporary name element." Applicants disagree. Applicants have reviewed Sakaki in its entirety and submit that it fails to teach relationships that swap names such that "the name of the first Relationship is transferred to said temporary name element, (b) the name of the second Relationship is transferred to said first Relationship, and (c) said name stored in the temporary name element is copied to said second Relationship." Accordingly, for at least this additional reason Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 9. Insomuch as dependent claims 19, and 29 recite similar elements to that of claim 9, they too patentably define over the combination of Peng and Sakaki. Accordingly for at least this additional reason Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections to claim 19 and 29.

CONCLUSION

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance of all the claims.

Date: November 21, 2007

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439